UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,600	12/18/2001	Thierry Jacquin	D/A1192	6192

7590 12/14/2004

Patent Documentation Center
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20th Floor
100 Clinton Ave. S.
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER	
LAO, SUE X	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/017,600	JACQUIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sue Lao	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12/18/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites "selecting a fourth scenario from the plurality of services" in line 2, which is not consistent with selecting a service from the plurality of services, as disclosed and as recited in other claims (such as claims 1, 3). For the purpose of art rejection, it is interpreted as "selecting a fourth service from the plurality of services", as best understood and as it appears to be.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lieberman (U S Pat. 6,516,349).

As to claim 21, Lieberman teaches a method of accessing a service (content) in a system, comprising:

providing a plurality of services (content providers #1, #2, #3), wherein each service comprises a software component (content provider) associated with the system and provides at least one functionality (information service);

displaying the plurality of services in a browser (fig.s 4A, 4B), wherein each service has an http link associated with it for accessing the service directly (site URLs, fig. 4B);

selecting a service from the plurality of services; and accessing the service from the user interface [inherent to the operation of network URL facility]. See col. 11, lines 16-55.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al (U S Pat. 5,386,568).

As to claim 1, Wold teaches a method of integrating services in a system, comprising:

providing a plurality of services (functions, routines, applications), wherein each service comprises a software component (software modules) associated with the system and provides at least one functionality (functions) [col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 2];

displaying the plurality of services (icons) in a user interface (graphical a user interface), wherein each service has a link associated with it for accessing the service directly (connection to a component's input port); [col. 13, lines 45-63; col. 14, lines 9-21];

selecting a first service (software module 801) from the plurality of services;

selecting a second service (software module 803) from the plurality of services; and

piping (connect) the first and second services together such that output from the first service is provided as input to the second service (Make a Connection, col. 7, lines 18-49).

Wold does not call the configuration with the two services connected/piped a scenario. However, this would have been an obvious choice in view of the fact that there are other configurations disclosed. See fig.s 9, 10a, 10b.

As to claim 5, Wold teaches providing input to the scenario and validating output from the scenario (check data types, col. 9, lines 55-65; col. 16, lines 17-40).

9. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al as applied to claim 1 in view of Willimas (U S Pat. 5,850,548).

As to claim 2, Williams teaches associating a link (input port) with a scenario (component "processing" containing sub-components) for accessing the scenario directly. See col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 18; fig.s 4C, 4F.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to associating a link with the scenario for accessing the scenario directly in Wold. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Wold and Williams because this would

have provided explicit and simple modular decomposition of program functionalities (Williams, col. 2, lines 29-39).

As to claim 3, Williams teaches selecting a third service from the plurality of services; and piping the first, second and third services together to form a second scenario, such that the output from the second service is provided as input to the third service (fig. 4E). Note discussion of claim 2 for a motivation to combine.

As to claim 4, Williams teaches selecting a fourth service from the plurality of services; and substituting the fourth service for the second service such that any of the output the first service, the second service or both the first service and the second service is provided as the input of the fourth service (fig. 4E, 4F, and other configurations). Note discussion of claim 2 for a motivation to combine.

10. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al as applied to claim 1 in view of Dan (U S Pat. 5,867,651).

As to claim 8, Dan teaches providing a filter control (filter network 180) comprising a plurality of selectable criteria (filters 150, 151, 152), wherein the criteria refer to conditions defined for each of the services criteria (filters 150, 151, 152); selecting at least one criteria in the filter control (from configuration file, col. 3, lines 10-29); executing the filter control and displaying any results (output to browser), wherein the results comprise a subset of the plurality of services (configurable filter network).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a filter control in Wold. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Wold and Dan because this would have provided extended functionality and dynamic modification of services (Dan, col. 1, lines 46-48; col. 2, lines 18-20).

11. Claims 6, 7, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al as applied to claim 1 in view of Lieberman (U S Pat. 6,516,349).

As to claims 6, 7, Lieberman teaches a user interface comprises a browser (browser 110) and a link comprises an http path from the browser to its corresponding

service (site URL, fig. 4B), Lieberman teaches a knowledge management system (content provider manager).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a browser, http path and knowledge management system into Wold. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Wold and Lieberman because this would have allowed components to be added, removed or changed without service downtime (Lieberman, col. 1, lines 43-55).

As to claim 9, Lieberman teaches a plurality of services (fig. 4A, 4B) of the customizable web portal (col. 1, line 58 – col. 2, line 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to also include hyperbolic tree view builder, a mail sender, a PDF converter, a search engine, a document summarizer, a database, a term extractor, a terms extractor, a translator, an image extractor and a dictionary into Wold as modified because these are typical web portal services.

12. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al as applied to claim 1 in view of Williams and Dan.

As to claim 10, Williams teaches each service includes a control panel for implementing the service (library panel, fig. 6B) and Dan teaches a filter control for selecting criteria pertaining to the service (filter network 180). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include includes a control panel and a filter control into Wold. Note discussions of claims 2 and 8 for motivations to combine.

13. Claims 11, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al as applied to claim 1 in view of Pike (U S Pat. 5,579,469).

As to claim 11, it is covered by claim 1 except for using a scripting shell to implement piping. Note discussion of claim 1. PiKe teaches using a scripting shell (shell script) to provide a user interface (user interface, browser) [abstract; col. 1, lines 40-67]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to drive the user interface of Wold with shell script. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Wold and Pike because this would have provided automatic heuristic and

defaults to achieve communications with minimal mouse and keyboard activity (abstract, col. 1, lines 41-55).

As to claim 19, Wold teaches means for associating a service with the system (make all desired connections, col. 12, lines 56-66).

14. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al in view of Pike as applied to claim 11 and further in view of Willimas.

As to claim 12, note discussion of claim 2.

15. Claims 13, 14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al in view of Pike as applied to claim 11 and further in view of Lieberman.

As to claims 13, 14, 16, note discussions of claims 6, 7, 9, respectively.

16. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al in view of Pike as applied to claim 11 and further in view of Dan.

As to claim 15, note discussion of claim 8 and Dan further teaches a list of services (filter table, fig. 4) [it is noted that each filter in the table represents a filtering service/function].

17. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al in view of Pike as applied to claim 11 and further in view of Williams and Dan.

As to claim 17, note discussion of claim 10.

18. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wold et al in view of Pike and Dan as applied to claim 15 and further in view of Lieberman.

As to claim 18, note discussion of claim 7 knowledge management system. Typical knowledge management systems, such as inventory/asset management systems, provide selectable criteria comprising vendor, name, model, serial number, manufacturer, version, location and domain. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include such selectable criteria into Lieberman to characterize the variety of providers.

19. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lieberman in view of Williams and Pike.

As to claim 20, note discussion of claim 21 for plurality of services and web browser for displaying. Note discussion of claim 2 for means for associating a link with. Lieberman further teaches web portal (user customizable web portal). Williams teaches responsive to selection of a first service and a second service (fig. 4D, user click, col. 6, lines 62-63) from the plurality of services, for piping the first and second services together to form a scenario such that output from the first service is provided as input to the second service (fig. 4E, connect together ports of sub-components, col. 7, lines 9-18). Note discussion of claim 11 with respect to Pike for using a scripting shell to provide user interface functions / piping. It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Lieberman and Williams so as to provide explicit and simple modular decomposition of program functionalities (Williams, col. 2, lines 29-39). Further, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Lieberman as modified and Pike so as to provide automatic and default communications between software components with minimal mouse and keyboard activity (Pike, col. 1, lines 41-55).

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sue Lao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3764. A voice mail service is also available at this number. The examiner's supervisor, SPE Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (571) 272 3756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, from 9AM to 5PM. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 23, 2004

SUE LAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER